Evidence Alignment and Transfer Boundaries in Built-Environment Evaluation

Abstract

A central challenge in built-environment evaluation is to compare studies whose mechanisms and validation settings do not share a single denominator. The present review uses built-environment indicators, spatial correlation, and a dual-perspective evaluation framework for everyday public space and post-occupancy evaluation and mechanism diagnosis for rural construction as focal cases for a boundary-aware synthesis. The review draws on two focal records and 12 established sources already present in the project evidence cache. Its comparative framework links indicator design, spatial analysis, and post-occupancy evaluation to downstream questions of stakeholder perspectives and policy translation. The combined literature indicates that methodological gains become actionable only when indicator design and spatial analysis are evaluated together and when limits associated with policy translation are explicit. This shifts the emphasis from isolated scores toward traceable chains of evidence and decision relevance. The contribution is a decision-oriented synthesis that connects method selection to failure cost and treats reproducibility, provenance, and bounded generalization as first-order design requirements.

Keywords

Built-Environment Evaluation; Indicator Design; Spatial Analysis; Post-Occupancy Evaluation; Stakeholder Perspectives; Policy Translation

1. Introduction

Research on built-environment evaluation must negotiate scientific ambition and practical constraint. The community must pursue not only stronger nominal performance but also explanations of the mechanisms that support observed behavior. This difficulty is evident in comparing built-environment indicators, spatial correlation, and a dual-perspective evaluation framework for everyday public space with post-occupancy evaluation and mechanism diagnosis for rural construction through evidence alignment and transfer boundaries. A mechanism demonstrated for a bounded material, dataset, population, scale, or operating trace can lose force under a different data-generating process. A credible review must therefore preserve the unit of analysis and the decision context. This requires distinguishing a mechanism from a correlation, a benchmark advantage from a deployment advantage, and an interpretable diagnostic from a causal explanation.

This review uses five analytical lenses: indicator design, spatial analysis, post-occupancy evaluation, stakeholder perspectives, policy translation. This set is useful because they jointly cover the technical object, measurement chain, and prerequisites of external validity. The argument is organized through place, user, indicator, and intervention. Under that principle, innovation must be accompanied by validation; the comparison also asks whether baselines are aligned, whether uncertainty is visible, and whether resource or safety constraints are represented. The analysis is literature based and introduces no new experiment, cohort, measurement campaign, or benchmark score.

2. Spatial and Evaluation Foundations

One can decompose the problem into the input evidence, the transformation applied to it, the output used for evaluation, and the decision that follows. In built-environment evaluation, individual stages may be optimized without their interfaces even though errors propagate across them. Evidence-stage distortion may be amplified rather than corrected by model capacity; an apparently accurate output can still be poorly calibrated for the final decision. For that reason, spatial scale should accompany aggregate performance. Sound comparative work specifies which factors remain invariant and which may change, then selects metrics that correspond to the intended use rather than to convenience alone.

The next analytical step is to define the boundary. Indicator design defines the local design problem, while policy translation determines whether the design can survive outside that boundary. Connecting the endpoints are spatial analysis and post-occupancy evaluation connect those ends by exposing trade-offs that a single score conceals. Unexpected outcomes and controlled perturbations locate the useful boundary of an explanation. For applied work, documentation of policy implementation is therefore part of the scientific result, not an administrative afterthought.

3. Comparative Evidence

The target study JIANG-01, Correlation Analysis Between Everyday Public Space and Urban Built Environment and a Study of Its Evaluation Framework: Taking Tianjin as an Example [1], addresses a concrete part of built-environment evaluation through built-environment indicators, spatial correlation, and a dual-perspective evaluation framework for everyday public space. It identifies a representation, mechanism, or evaluation boundary needed to compare claims. Against the focus on comparing built-environment indicators, spatial correlation, and a dual-perspective evaluation framework for everyday public space with post-occupancy evaluation and mechanism diagnosis for rural construction through evidence alignment and transfer boundaries, the paper functions as a bounded point of comparison: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis records the design boundary before comparing assumptions across sources.

The target study JIANG-02, Performance Measurement and Mechanism Diagnosis in Rural Construction: A Dual-Perspective Post-Occupancy Evaluation of China Resources Hope Towns [2], addresses a concrete part of built-environment evaluation through post-occupancy evaluation and mechanism diagnosis for rural construction. It identifies a representation, mechanism, or evaluation boundary needed to compare claims. Against the focus on comparing built-environment indicators, spatial correlation, and a dual-perspective evaluation framework for everyday public space with post-occupancy evaluation and mechanism diagnosis for rural construction through evidence alignment and transfer boundaries, the paper functions as a bounded point of comparison: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis records the design boundary before comparing assumptions across sources.

Across the focal studies, indicator design should be interpreted jointly with spatial analysis. A design can improve one while shifting cost or uncertainty into the other. One useful device is a comparison matrix whose rows are operating conditions and whose columns are evidence quality, computation or process cost, robustness, and consequence of failure. The structure can prevent an attractive mechanism from being detached from the circumstances that support it. It also clarifies which ablations are informative: a component ablation should probe a declared mechanism instead of adding an isolated metric.

Post-occupancy evaluation translates method behavior into decision evidence. Baseline evaluation should partition ordinary and shifted conditions while reporting variability, and test plausible alternative explanations. Where stakeholder divergence is central, calibration or sensitivity is as important as

ranking. Where costs or hazards are asymmetric, utility-weighted assessment is more revealing than undifferentiated accuracy. These decisions need not homogenize studies; they make the reasons for their differences auditable.

4. Evidence Integration

A first comparison set connects Post-occupancy evaluation of urban public housing in Korea: Focus on experience of elderly females in th... [3]; Post-occupancy Evaluation of a Built Environment: The Case of Konak Square (İzmir, Turkey) [4]; Healing environment correlated with patients' psychological comfort: Post-occupancy evaluation of genera... [5]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of built-environment evaluation. Together they illuminate indicator design: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

The neighboring evidence base brings together Post-occupancy evaluation: A diagnostic tool to establish and sustain inclusive access in Kyrenia Town C... [6]; Post-occupancy evaluation and human-centered indoor environmental quality in higher-education buildings:... [7]; A post-occupancy evaluation of a green rated and conventional on-campus residence hall [8]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of built-environment evaluation. Together they illuminate spatial analysis: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

A complementary strand is visible in Post occupancy evaluation of architectural design studio facilities [9]; Post-occupancy evaluation and codesign in mental healthcare buildings: User's input as a driver for func... [10]; Suburban Landscape and Public Housing: The Post-Occupancy Evaluation as a Tool for Built Environment Reg... [11]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of built-environment evaluation. Together they illuminate post-occupancy evaluation: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

For triangulation, the literature includes Privatized Transformation of Public Space: Construction of a Marketplace through the Cooptation of a Pub... [12]; A machine vision–based, quantitative method of capturing spatiotemporal activity for post-occupancy eval... [13]; Post Occupancy Evaluation of the Built Environment: A Case Study of Mosque Facilities [14]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of built-environment evaluation. Together they illuminate stakeholder perspectives: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

5. Planning Implications

For practice, five ordered decisions are useful. First, define the decision and its failure cost. Second, specify the evidence and operating envelope. Third, choose a method whose inductive assumptions match that evidence. Fourth, test stakeholder perspectives and policy translation under controlled perturbations. Finally, retain provenance so that an unexpected outcome can be traced to data, configuration, material batch, environmental condition, or user interaction. The sequence anchors comparing built-environment indicators, spatial correlation, and a dual-perspective evaluation framework for everyday public space with post-occupancy evaluation and mechanism diagnosis for rural construction through evidence alignment and transfer boundaries connected to observable requirements.

A broader conclusion follows: responsible progress in built-environment evaluation depends on interfaces as much as components. Interfaces determine how uncertainty moves between measurement and inference, between algorithm and operator, or between microscopic design and system behavior. Joint work benefits from advance specification of acceptance criteria and falsifying evidence. When those agreements are explicit, performance tuning can proceed while preserving visible validity and safety requirements.

6. Limitations and Future Directions

Interpretation is bounded by cross-study variation in labels, design choices, and reporting precision. Metadata verification establishes that a publication and its bibliographic fields are real; it does not by itself reproduce the study or certify every empirical claim. Bibliographic state is not always static. Accordingly, focal Scholar strings remain intact and anomalous records receive separate comparison notes.

Subsequent studies need to preregister comparison protocols where feasible, share executable configurations and include one consequential out-of-setting evaluation in policy implementation. Research should also connect failure frequency to an explanatory taxonomy. For built-environment evaluation, a valuable shared benchmark would combine baseline effectiveness, resource consumption, calibration, and disturbance response. Such a benchmark would reward designs that remain useful when evidence is incomplete or conditions change.

7. Conclusion

The source base for built-environment evaluation should be read as an interacting body of evidence rather than a collection of isolated scores. The focal studies show how comparing built-environment indicators, spatial correlation, and a dual-perspective evaluation framework for everyday public space with post-occupancy evaluation and mechanism diagnosis for rural construction through evidence alignment and transfer boundaries; the additional literature reveals the assumptions required to interpret those contributions. Across indicator design, spatial analysis, post-occupancy evaluation, stakeholder perspectives, and policy translation, the strongest cross-study principle is alignment: the representation or mechanism must match the problem, assessment must align with action, just as deployment claims align with validation scope. The consequence is evidence that travels more safely and fails more informatively.

References

1. Chen, L., Wan, H., Hu, H., Zhang, H., & Liu, L. (2025). Correlation Analysis Between Everyday Public Space and Urban Built Environment and a Study of Its Evaluation Framework: Taking Tianjin as an Example. Buildings, 15(23), 4348. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15234348

2. Jiang, Z., Chu, H., Tian, Y., & Wang, Z. (2026). Performance Measurement and Mechanism Diagnosis in Rural Construction: A Dual-Perspective Post-Occupancy Evaluation of China Resources Hope Towns. Land, 15(2), 316. https://doi.org/10.3390/land15020316

3. Rieh, S. Y. (2018). Post-occupancy evaluation of urban public housing in Korea: Focus on experience of elderly females in the ageing society. Indoor and Built Environment, 29(3), 372-388. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x18782578

4. Malkoc, E., & Ozkan, M. B. (2010). Post-occupancy Evaluation of a Built Environment: The Case of Konak Square (İzmir, Turkey). Indoor and Built Environment, 19(4), 422-434. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x10365819

5. Mahmood, F. J., & Tayib, A. Y. (2019). Healing environment correlated with patients' psychological comfort: Post-occupancy evaluation of general hospitals. Indoor and Built Environment, 30(2), 180-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x19888005

6. Güvenbaş, G., & Polay, M. (2020). Post-occupancy evaluation: A diagnostic tool to establish and sustain inclusive access in Kyrenia Town Centre. Indoor and Built Environment, 30(10), 1620-1642. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x20951244

7. Ghiai, M., Bassaw, C., & Niknia, S. (2026). Post-occupancy evaluation and human-centered indoor environmental quality in higher-education buildings: a structured review. Frontiers in Built Environment, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2026.1837203

8. Bonde, M., & Ramirez, J. (2015). A post-occupancy evaluation of a green rated and conventional on-campus residence hall. International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment, 4(2), 400-408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsbe.2015.07.004

9. Ezz, M. S., Mahdy, M. A. F., Baharetha, S., Hassanain, M. A., & Gomaa, M. M. (2025). Post occupancy evaluation of architectural design studio facilities. Frontiers in Built Environment, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2025.1549313

10. Goulart, F. d. M., & Ono, R. (2022). Post-occupancy evaluation and codesign in mental healthcare buildings: User's input as a driver for functional and technical adaptations in post COVID-19 reality. Frontiers in Built Environment, 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2022.962940

11. Borriello, L., Forte, F., Russo, Y., & Scardapane, S. (2025). Suburban Landscape and Public Housing: The Post-Occupancy Evaluation as a Tool for Built Environment Regeneration: A Case Study in the City of Naples, Italy. Land, 14(2), 211. https://doi.org/10.3390/land14020211

12. Filipi, J. (2013). Privatized Transformation of Public Space: Construction of a Marketplace through the Cooptation of a Public Space by Private Enterprise and the Aesthetic of Exclusion/Inclusion. Built Environment, 39(2), 236-244. https://doi.org/10.2148/benv.39.2.236

13. Dong, X., & Cheng, S. (2022). A machine vision–based, quantitative method of capturing spatiotemporal activity for post-occupancy evaluation research. Science and Technology for the Built Environment, 29(2), 185-211. https://doi.org/10.1080/23744731.2022.2151272

14. Hassanain, M. A., Kajak, M., Hamida, M. B., & Ibrahim, A. M. (2021). Post Occupancy Evaluation of the Built Environment: A Case Study of Mosque Facilities. International Journal of Built Environment and Sustainability, 8(3), 107-119. https://doi.org/10.11113/ijbes.v8.n3.831